



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

✓  
ai

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,038	11/04/2003	Jere W. McBride	D6481	9804
7590	04/25/2005		EXAMINER	
David L. Parker Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. 600 Congress Avenue Suite 2400 Austin, TX 78701				ZEMAN, ROBERT A
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1645
DATE MAILED: 04/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/701,038	MCBRIDE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Robert A. Zeman	1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5,7-14 and 16-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 6 and 15 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1-21-05</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's election of Group II in the reply filed on 1-18-2005 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claims 6 and 15 are currently under examination.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1-21-2005 is acknowledged. An initialed copy is attached hereto.

***Drawings***

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the gels depicted in Figures 2-5 are not of sufficient clarity to allow evaluation of said figures. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The rejected claims are drawn to the prophylactic use of the *Ehrlichia canis* p153 protein (i.e. a vaccine). To be a prophylactic composition, the composition must elicit protective immunity, demonstrable by pathogen challenge experiments in a reasonable model system. The specification, as filed, does not set forth that the claimed use of the claimed deletion provides any sort of protective immunity in any model system that can be extrapolated to humans or other animals. Applicant discusses vaccines in a prophetic sense but fails to demonstrate the ability to induce immunity in any animal system. While the skill in the art of immunology is high, to date, prediction of protective immunity for any given composition in any given animal is quite unpredictable.

Moreover, while Applicant discloses that immunoreactive epitopes of the *E. canis* p153 protein have been identified, said epitopes are not disclosed nor are any immuno-protective epitopes identified. Protective immunity is based on the ability of an organism to produce antibodies aid in the elimination of a pathogen from said organism. Antibodies specifically bind to given "immuno-epitopes" of the antigen and while all proteins will induce the production of

antibodies, proteins with differing amino acid sequences will induce different antibodies. It is impossible to predict which proteins will induce protective antibodies since the change of a single amino acid in the protein sequence of the antigen can effectively abolish the interaction between an antigen and an antibody (Colman Res. Immunology, Jan 1994, Vol. 145, pages 33-36) a difference in even a single amino acid could radically affect the ability of a given antigen to induce protective immunity. Given the lack of success in the art, the lack of working examples and the unpredictability of the generation of protective immunity, the specification, as filed, does not provide enablement for the use of the *Ehrlichia canis* p153 protein as a vaccine.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McBride et al. (Journal of Clinical Microbiology, Jan. 2001, Vol. 39 No. 1, pages 315-322 – IDS).

McBride et al. disclose a protein having the sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 (see attached STIC sequence search report).

Moreover, it should be noted that the claim language used with regard to the claimed sequence is open and hence reads full-length genomic *Ehrlichia canis* DNA which is also

disclosed in the cited reference (see the Materials and Methods section on page 316). Finally, with regard to claim 15, "vaccine" is deemed an intended use and hence is given no patentable weight. With regard to the art, a p153 vaccine is identical to a p153 protein since both would have the same immunological properties.

***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Art Unit: 1645

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert A. Zeman

April 20, 2005